-- REMARKS --

The present amendment replies to an Office Action dated December 27, 2007. Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, and 11-13 have been amended herein. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 12, and 13 on various grounds, and objected to and did not examine claims 4-11. The Applicants respond to each ground of rejection as subsequently recited herein and requests reconsideration of the present application.

Specification

The Examiner required a new abstract of the disclosure presented on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract is enclosed for insertion as a new page following page 11 of the application. Withdrawal of the objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the specification as missing titles. The Applicants respectfully decline to add the titles, as they are only suggested and not required. *See* MPEP §608.01(a).

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 4-11 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form as multiple dependent claims referring to other multiple dependent claims. Claims 4-6, 9, and 11 have been amended herein to correct the form and not to avoid any reference. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 4-11 and consideration of claims 4-11 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to claims 12 and 13 for informalities in lacking antecedent basis. Claims 12 and 13 have been amended herein to correct the informalities and not to avoid any reference. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 12 and 13 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being a single means claim. Claim 12 has been amended herein to recite an additional means element and not to avoid any reference. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Obviousness is a question of law, based on the factual inquiries of 1) determining the scope and content of the prior art; 2) ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and 3) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. *Graham v. John Deere Co.,* 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). *See* MPEP 2143.03. The Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

A. Claims 1-3, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,479,187 to Chen (the *Chen* patent) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,034,895 to Okunuki, *et al.* (the *Okunuki* patent).

The Applicants respectfully assert that the *Chen* patent and the *Okunuki* patent, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' invention as claimed, as required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The *Chen* patent and the *Okunuki* patent fail to disclose:

a method for enhancing brightness and contrast in images wherein relative brightness of the parts of said image is determined from the maximum brightness in the parts of said image, as recited in amended independent claim 1;

an image processor including means for determining relative brightness of parts of a respective image from the maximum brightness in the parts of said image, as recited in amended independent claim 12; or

a regulation and controlling system for a projection-based presenter wherein relative brightness of the parts of said image is determined from the maximum brightness in the parts of said image, as recited in amended independent claim 13.

At most, the *Okunuki* patent discloses detecting the average luminance level for one frame (or one field) of the video signal, and outputting an amplification coefficient depending on the detected average luminance level. The APL detection circuit obtains the average picture level (APL) of the luminance level of the video area in the entire video signals of one frame (or field). *See* Abstract; column 6, lines 52-59.

Claims 2 and 3 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and so include all the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable over the *Chen* patent and the *Okunuki* patent for at least the same reasons as set forth above for independent claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Chen* patent in view of the *Okunuki* patent is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 12, and 13 and consideration of claims 4-11 is requested. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-13 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103, and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: **March 25, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,
PETER LURKENS, *et al.*

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Robert J. Kraus
Registration No. 26,358
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113

Frank C. Nicholas
Registration No. 33,983
Attorney for Applicant